

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. 10/689,785 10/21/2003 William K. Dail 060507-1054 7567 EXAMINER 26371 7590 01/25/2006 **FOLEY & LARDNER LLP** JIANG, CHEN WEN 777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **SUITE 3800** MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308 3744

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			(
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/689,785	DAIL, WILLIAM K.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Chen-Wen Jiang	3744
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF. HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to revent the mailing three months after the mail patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tile od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
1)⊠ 2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 November 2005</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims		
5)☐ 6)⋈ 7)⋈ 8)☐ Applicati 9)☐ 10)⋈	Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-43 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withde Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-12,14-32 and 34-43 is/are rejected to Claim(s) 33 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and con Papers The specification is objected to by the Example the drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2003 is/at Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the oath or declaration is objected to by the	rawn from consideration. ed. d/or election requirement. iner. are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Selection is required if the drawing(s) is objected the drawing(s).	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 			
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/r r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	

Art Unit: 3744

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The amendments and arguments presented by the applicant have been duly noted.

However, an update search and further review of the prior art of record has prompted the presentation of new rejections presented below. In view of such, the previous rejections in the first office action have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1,2,4-9,24-32,34-37 and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staples et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,344,296) in view of Rutishauser et al. (U.S. Patent Number 3,210,957).

In regard to claims 1,2,4-7,24,27-32,34-37 and 39-43 Staples et al. disclose an efficient second stage cooling system. Referring to Fig.1, the system comprises a refrigeration device with

Application/Control Number: 10/689,785

Art Unit: 3744

compressor 8, condenser 14, expansion device 18 and evaporator 22, a cooling system with conduits 30,32 and second refrigerant, heat exchanger 4 within the storage area 2 and heat exchanger 24. However, Staples et al. does not disclose modular unit. Rutishauser et al. discloses modular heat exchanger unit 12 with different capacity can be inserted or removed in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of cooling requirement. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Staples et al. with a modular unit in view of Rutishauser et al. so as to arrange the cooling requirement.

In regard to claims 8,9,25 and 26, the location of the modular element is a design choice.

Under the principals of inherency, if a prior art device, in its normal and usual operation, would necessarily perform the method claimed, then the method claimed will be considered to be anticipated by the prior art device. When the prior art device is the same as a device described in the specification for carrying out the claimed method, it can be assumed the device will inherently perform the claimed process. *Ir re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

4. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staples et al. and Rutishauser et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wolff et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,924,297).

In regard to claim 3, Wolff et al. disclose that there has been development work in utilizing non-compressible liquid chemical coolants (so called "glycol-type" systems using glycol or ethylene solutions or some other secondary heat transfer liquid) with control valves for producing the merchandiser cooling effect.

Art Unit: 3744

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staples et al. and Rutishauser et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Norton (U.S. Patent Number 4,501,126) or Morrison et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,493,010).

Staples et al. and Rutishauser et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Staples et al. and Rutishauser et al. do not disclose quick disconnect device. Norton and Morrison et al. disclose quick disconnect device in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of connect/disconnect evaporator. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Staples et al. and Rutishauser et al. with a quick disconnect device in view of Norton or Morrison et al. so as to have quick connection.

6. Claims 12 and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staples et al. and Rutishauser et al. in view of Wolff et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,924,297).

In regard to claims 12,14-18 and 21, Referring to Fig. 1, of Staples et al., the system comprises a refrigeration device with compressor 8, condenser 14, expansion device 18 and evaporator 22, a cooling system with conduits 30,32 and second refrigerant, heat exchanger 4 within the storage area 2 and heat exchanger 24. Rutishauser et al. discloses modular heat exchanger unit 12 with different capacity can be inserted or removed in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of cooling requirement. Wolff et al. disclose that there has been development work in utilizing non-compressible liquid chemical coolants (so called "glycoltype" systems using glycol or ethylene solutions or some other secondary heat transfer liquid) with control valves for producing the merchandiser cooling effect.

In regard to claims 19 and 20, the location of the modular element is a design choice.

Art Unit: 3744

In regard to claim 22, the fin-coil heat exchanger is an existing heat exchanger in the prior art.

7. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staples et al. and Rutishauser et al. in view of Wolff et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,924,297).

Wolff et al. disclose that there has been development work in utilizing non-compressible liquid chemical coolants (so called "glycol-type" systems using glycol or ethylene solutions or some other secondary heat transfer liquid) with control valves for producing the merchandiser cooling effect.

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staples et al., Rutishauser et al. and Wolff et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Wolff et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Norton (U.S. Patent Number 4,501,126) or Morrison et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,493,010).

Staples et al., Rutishauser et al. and Wolff et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Staples et al., Rutishauser et al. and Wolff et al. do not disclose quick disconnect device. Norton and Morrison et al. disclose quick disconnect device in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of connect/disconnect evaporator. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Staples et al., Rutishauser et al. and Wolff et al. with a quick disconnect device in view of Norton or Morrison et al. so as to have quick connection.

Application/Control Number: 10/689,785 Page 6

Art Unit: 3744

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 33 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chen-Wen Jiang whose telephone number is (571) 272-4809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 to 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chen-Wen Jiang
Primary Examiner

